

Introduction

An Identity under Question

ENJOYING A FOREIGN DISH means more than ingesting food; it is an acknowledgment that the Other has a value worth welcoming into one's being. During the last decades of the twentieth century, the cuisines of Thailand, Vietnam, Bali, and Singapore gained international acceptance and prestige. So have other expressions of their culture. As recently as the 1960s, Southeast Asian arts were classified as either "Farther Indian" or "Chinese"; these labels have since been dropped and the unique features of each style appreciated. May we expect that the same respect will eventually be accorded our Filipino arts, specifically those created in the Christianized, Hispanized lowlands?

In the realm of taste, as in other realms, such respect is closer now than before, but still remote. Part of the problem is presentation. Ordinary Filipino restaurants, both here and abroad, do not make their offerings visually attractive. As even Filipinos complain, "Everything looks brown!" And, because our restaurateurs skimp, they will not serve the *sawsawan* [dipping sauce] in a saucer but instead stock it in a bottle on the table. But as serious, as this lack of concern for the customer, is the question of self-respect. While Filipinos love their cuisine, when asked about its characteristics, some

answer, "There really is no Filipino cooking. It's Spanish, it's Chinese." Or worse, according to a Filipina who runs a Thai restaurant, "Kare-kare" like the rest is bastardized cooking."

Some Filipinos' tendency to denigrate, without basis, their major cultural symbols shows in other realms, and works against us. During the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation conference held in Subic in December 1996, the participating heads of states were photographed wearing barong Tagalog made for the occasion. This should have been a glorious hour for our designers, and for the Philippines as a whole. It was not to be. Local writers repeated the legend of how the shirt came about. Supposedly the wicked Spaniards compelled Filipinos to wear their shirttails out to mark their low status, and obliged them to use a transparent fabric so as to expose their weapons (Ramos 1996, 11). Thanks to this cliché, the *Bangkok Post* trumpeted that the Filipino national shirt was a "slave shirt" (Cunanan 1996, 6). Thanks again to this cliché, some Filipinos, like an uncle of mine, now refuse to wear the barong Tagalog.

While studying and teaching in the U.S., a frequent insinuation I met was "Oh, the Philippines? You mean tree houses/little bamboo huts/Smokey Mountain"? I countered this by showing books on our houses in wood and stone from the 1800s to the 1930s and on our baroque churches. For large, free-standing structures either in timber or stone that attempt to symbolize the cosmos and Man's place within it indicate a sophisticated level of social development. They require a variety of highly specialized skills from masonry to mathematics, a managerial class to coordinate thousands of artisans, and speculative thinkers. Such structures first appeared in the Near East three millennia before Christ; then in India and China; and, during the first millennium after Christ, in other Asian countries. Examples are the temples of Nara and Kyoto, the sacred city of Angkor, and the vast stupa of Borobudur. However, in the lowlands of Luzon and Visayas, available data indicate that such stone structures with cosmic symbolism would appear only from the early seventeenth century onward in the form of churches.² The native

artisans who built these eighteenth-nineteenth-century churches had a good knowledge of the Golden Mean, as shown by a recent, unpublished study by the Spanish architect Santiago Porras. Often, their designs and their details are exquisite. But many educated Filipinos feel alienated. They deride these designs as products of "forced labor."³ I have heard architects dismiss this stone legacy as "a colonial imposition."

Equally downgraded are other highlights of our cultural heritage. While a tour operator agrees on the need to showcase the Philippines' Spanish-influenced arts, he speaks of them "as bastardized Spanish." Another friend, who conceptualized a tour for the modern art collection of the GSIS, the Central Bank collection of pre-Hispanic gold jewelry, and the museum of San Agustin, says that "Modern art and pre-Hispanic old jewelry are us Filipinos. Those baroque saints and carvings have no connection to us." Has she ever attended processions and seen how important these baroque-garbed saints are in fostering municipal solidarity? I wonder. During one 12 June celebration at the East-West Center in Honolulu, I invited practitioners of Filipino martial arts to perform before an international audience. However, a visiting Tagalog asked me why I featured *eskrima*. "Why not Maranao martial arts?" Unconsciously he thought "eskrima," because derived from the Spanish word *escrima*, was less authentic. He should have listened to a young German expert in martial arts explain our martial arts, which he teaches. Unlike Indian and Chinese martial arts whose center of gravity is the navel, "Your eskrima has the heart as the center."

When describing outstanding artifacts of their own culture, I hear educated Filipinos use adjectives such as "bastardized" and "mongrel." Sometimes they use kinder, but still condescending, adjectives such as "imitative" or "derivative."

Anxieties about Identity

Identity simultaneously includes and excludes. To define yourself as part of a group is to distance yourself from those who are outside it

(Hall and Gay 1996, 4-5). Identity has several dimensions. Depending on the situation, you may choose to affirm an identity based on, for instance, any of the following: family, religion, class, gender, or nation. Preoccupations with a national identity began with the birth of the nation-state during the 1789 French Revolution. Previously, the state's legitimacy derived from its association with a ruler endowed with semidivine attributes. Supposedly, the king had a healing touch and, depending on the country, enjoyed titles such as "His Most Christian Majesty" (France), "His Catholic Majesty" (Spain), "Son of Heaven" (China), or "God-King" (Java). But with the downfall of thrones, henceforth, the state drew its legitimacy from the "will of the people." But what was the "people"? The old term "nation" was redefined to designate a group separate from others because of its distinct language, history, traditions, and mission. Thus, though the French revolutionists fought against the Bourbons, they pursued with more vehemence the latter's goal of unifying the various linguistically divided peoples of the realm by using just one administrative language. And they now deemed it important to endow the "people/nation" with a heroic past and the promise of a glorious future.⁴

During the same period, the German scholar Gottfried Herder (Ergang 1956) claimed that each people [*Volk*] had a spirit [*Geist*], manifest above all in their unique language and literature, which needed to be studied and respected. He deemed it unnatural for Germans to slavishly emulate outsiders like the French; he believed it more natural to develop institutions and learning that accorded with the *Volksgeist*. Herder's ideas spread worldwide and inspired studies on popular culture in all its dimensions. They challenged other peoples to define their "national" characteristics.⁵

Today, however, the notion of a "national culture" is under attack, for what is called a "nation" is not monolithic. It brings together peoples who differ from each other in religion, ethnicity, social class, and gender. Moreover, the "national," if it indeed is real, constitutes only one dimension of an individual's reality. Indeed even

"culture" itself is under scrutiny. Herder's notion of culture, which he referred to as *Volksgeist*, now seems too restrictive. According to Wolfgang Ivers (in Featherstone and Lash 1999, 95), it assumes a social uniformity which does not exist. People differ in lifestyle according to social class and gender preference. Modern cultures are themselves "multicultural." Herder envisioned a culture that was pure because it unflinchingly excluded the foreign. Members are supposed to experience "insensibility, coldness, blindness," even "contempt and disgust" (ibid.) toward outsiders. Herder's vision of cultural identity leads to political conflicts and wars, according to Ivers.

But the preoccupation with a national identity is inevitable. For the global village continues to be divided into nation-states, each protective of its interests and each eager to maximize its gains.⁶ In competing for prestige, identity is crucial, and with it, heritage. In the European Union, for instance, the member states insist on the use of their own particular language even though one working language would be more efficient. At stake are pride, millennial traditions, and potential influence. Or consider China which waged a bitter Communist revolution against feudal landlords and Western capitalist imperialists. Recently, the People's Republic mounted an expensive world-class production of the vaguely anti-Chinese opera of Puccini, *Turandot*, at Beijing's Forbidden City. No doubt officials calculated that projecting the magnificent palaces of former feudal despots through an ambivalent foreign opera would attract tourism and trade. Rather than scrap the concept of national identity as useless, we could make it more complex and more supple.⁷

Preoccupations with a national identity have intensified among us, educated Filipinos, since independence in 1946. We believe that the diverse peoples of the islands should have a common vision and a sense of pride in their heritage. At the same time we have to define our role vis-à-vis Asia, Southeast Asia, the World Powers, and other nations. Moreover, we are obliged to articulate our uniqueness when planning tourism campaigns, attracting investors, selling finished

products on the world market, or even when just entertaining foreign visitors.

It is not easy to affirm a Filipino identity. Like many other nation-states, the Philippines is culturally diverse. Many Filipinos, particularly in the hinterlands, still preserve the animism and other ways of our ancestors in the face of Hispanization and Islamization in the lowlands. Other Filipinos in Sulu and Mindanao embraced Islam by the fourteenth to the fifteenth centuries and through it constructed states that resisted Spanish aggression. The majority embraced Christianity; it accepted Hispanic and, subsequently, American practices. Such are the groups anthropologists call "lowland Christian Filipinos." Hispanization is present in varying degrees according to region and social class. It is more vivid in urban areas, particularly the metropolis, than in the countryside, among the bourgeoisie than among the workers. While the Spanish language did not penetrate down to the peasant, Christianity did so, along with music, cookery, visual styles, vocabulary, and social customs from Spain and parts of Spanish America. The lowland Christian majority often looks down on the two other Filipino groups. Paradoxically, it is they, rather than the other two, who are angst-ridden when attempting to define their cultural identity, as shown by examples above.

One reason for this angst may be that internationally there seems little respect for lowland Christian Filipino culture. We should take note of this because self-confidence and respect by others reinforce each other. If we are confident about our identity, others take notice of this and respect us. On the other hand, if others respect us, then our self-confidence deepens.

There is indeed a fund of respect for our culture in the Spanish-speaking world. Hence, in these essays, I refer with pleasure to our ties with Spaniards and Spanish Americans. Conversing with ordinary Spaniards, Mexicans, Colombians, and Argentines, who were not in academe, I met a number who had read on our history, on our presidents, on Rizal, and who wanted to know more. Nothing beats

the experience of hearing a Mexican shopkeeper talk about Rizal or a Colombian seaman mention events from Philippine history and exclaim that "we have a common history." Superbly crafted books and articles that discuss the contributions of the Philippines to Mexico and Spanish America via the galleon trade are published in Madrid and Mexico D.F. But these are not the people or the publications most educated, English-speaking Filipinos encounter. Their world consists rather of Anglo-Americans⁸ and English-speaking Asians, many of whom look down on the lowland Christian Filipino as an oddity because they cannot pigeonhole him that easily into either "Asian" or "Western." Even my Catholic students from Indonesia and Japan are puzzled when I bring them to the heritage towns of Paete and Taal: "Why is there so much Spanish in your culture? What is truly Filipino?" Since few Filipinos speak Spanish and since most of the foreigners and foreign publications they meet are English-speaking, they become anxious about their identity. Or else their preexisting anxiety is reinforced.

Puzzlement by non-Spanish speaking foreigners at the very least, disdain at worst: This shows in the scant attention artifacts of lowland Christian Filipino culture get in international overviews of national cultures. A book on national costumes from around the world (Kennett and Haig 1994) discusses and illustrates those of the Cordillera peoples rather than those of the lowland Christian majority. Two books on Southeast Asian textiles (Fraser-Lu 1988, Maxwell 1990) emphasize in both print and photograph the textiles of the Cordillera and merely glance at the textiles of the Ilocanos, Tagalogs, and Visayans. And yet the op-artlike weavings of the Ilocos are surely significant; while pina which is woven from pineapple fibers is unique in the world. The latter deserved colored photos—which it did not get. Even when a Filipino composes in the vernacular languages, he cannot be sure that he will be deemed original and truly authentic. A minencyclopedia on world music (Broughton et al. 1994, 438–39) downplays popular Filipino music—written mostly in Filipino—for being influenced by American and Spanish

models." A recent overview of contemporary Asian architects by Hasan-Uddin Khan (1995) discusses Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Malaysian, Thai, and Indonesian architects. It devotes only a short paragraph to the Philippines. Though it acknowledges that Leandro Locsin and "Bobby" Mañosa did "some interesting Modernist architecture in the 1970s," nonetheless, they "do not appear to have contributed to the dialogue of Asian architecture in the past decades" (ibid., 44). The substance of this "dialogue" is not defined. The minimal space given to these two architects is an anomaly in a book attempting a regional perspective. Locsin won an international award for Outstanding Architect of the Pacific early in his career; moreover, he designed the palace of the sultan of Brunei. Both Locsin and Mañosa have focused on creating an architecture that is both contemporary and responsive to tropical conditions. What is more, they have spoken in public about the need for such. Mañosa has done commissioned work for companies in East Asia. These are ignored by the author. Even in the Third World, we Filipinos are marginal.

Other examples abound. The Discovery Channel series on Asian martial arts, aired in 1999, made no mention of any of the Filipino martial arts even though these attract many non-Filipino American students in Hawaii and on the West Coast. Like the National Geographic Channel, this channel will feature the Philippines only if the material is from the supposedly "tribal" uplands or if it is something as kinky as Good Friday crucifixions. When asked by Discovery Channel to appear as commentator on Good Friday bloodletting, I asked why the rest of our Holy Week celebrations was ignored. They never answered me. While living in Hawaii in the early 1980s, I approached an officer of a reputable university press to propose that they market my book, *Philippine Ancestral Houses, 1810-1930*, and other such books on the Philippines, for I was sick and tired of all the negative stereotypes Americans had. The interview was revealing. She admired the book design but bluntly commented that when American libraries buy books they emphasize those Asian countries

that the State Department gives priority to, namely "Mainland Asia." Curiously, this includes Japan and Indonesia, both archipelagoes, but leaves out the Philippines! Moreover, "If it were a book on tribal Filipinos, it would sell; but not this type of book." Better yet, she said, would be books on Southeast Asia where the Philippines and other countries would be chapters. I did not tell her that in such a book, inevitably, the Philippines would play second fiddle to its more admired neighbors and that the culture of the lowland Christian majority would most likely be ignored. Subsequent books on Southeast Asian art, like those on textiles mentioned above, confirmed my fears.

Lowland Christian Filipinos may be English-speaking but their culture is less known and less appreciated among the English-speaking public in Asia, Europe, or the Anglo countries, than either the Tibetan or the Laotian. In the global competition for national prestige, the Ilocano, Tagalog, or the Visayan competes with one arm tied behind—partly, because of insecurities about our worth; but partly, too, because of the game rules that outsiders have imposed.

What would be wrong if the Tagalog or the Visayan projected instead the art of his tribal brothers? Nothing indeed. We Tagalogs and Visayans, should project our own pre-Hispanic, tribal heritage as well. But, for us Tagalogs or Visayans, this is only one segment of our heritage. To ignore our peasant and urban heritage, just because of the obvious Spanish influence, does violence to our identity. Moreover, for all the attention that the artifacts of hitherto tribal peoples now command internationally, the fact remains that in the U.S. and elsewhere, aboriginal culture continues to be looked down upon. A week after I first arrived in Honolulu in 1974 as a student, my White American roommate invited me to meet his friends and his parents. I wore an intricately embroidered piña barong Tagalog. His father, it turned out, had been to Manila several times. But this budding familiarity did not deter his father from asking me abruptly in front of others, "But what about the headhunters?"

Part of the stigma attached to Filipino cooking in the U.S. derives from its supposed association with "tribalism." While Northern Vietnamese and Southern Chinese eat dogs and cats, in Hawaii Filipinos are singled out for eating dog meat. My American-Chinese dentist, in all innocence, once remarked that "Filipinos eat raw meat; that is their diet." He did not know that even in isolated upland hamlets, such a diet is uncommon.

Because I am a Manileño who loves *adobo*, the barong Tagalog, the embroidered piña, baroque art, the fiesta, jotás, and Rolando Tinio's Tagalog poems that draw freely from the Spanish word chest, I have written this collection of essays in order to answer the following questions: Why do lowland Christian Filipinos experience an unease when reflecting on their Hispanized heritage? How has this unease been fed by current ways of reading history and culture? What might be an alternative way to read history and culture?

This unease stems from the way we (and outsiders) read our history and culture. It is partly attitudinal, partly methodological. Key major symbols fuse together native and Hispanic elements. Consider that most popular of Filipino dishes, the adobo. Chicken and/or pork is seasoned with pepper and salt, marinated in vinegar and soy sauce together with bay leaf (laurel) and plenty of garlic, and then cooked. Pickling has indigenous roots; soy sauce is Chinese-Japanese. When told that adobo comes from *adobado*, the Spanish for "pickled" and that the liking for bay leaf and garlic is very Mediterranean, friends react with, "Then it is not Filipino!"—instead of finding out how its taste differs from the peninsular adobado.

Their unease increases when they discover that the *harana*, or evening serenade, derives from the Spanish *jarana*, that the well-loved tinikling combines the pan-Southeast Asian bamboo dance with the beat of the jota, that our martial *eskrima* counts in Spanish and names its passes in Spanish,¹⁰ or that a full one-fourth of Tagalog words, including well-loved ones like *pamilya*, *karinyoso*, *nobyá*, *compare*, are Spanish in origin.¹¹

Filipinos love their way of life. However, problems appear when they reflect on their identity and try to explain this to themselves, to fellow Filipinos, or to outsiders. This is not helped by the readiness of biased Anglo-Americans and fellow Asians who scorn the Filipino for not being truly Asian. These problems and biases stem from (1) the demonization of Spanish influence, (2) a limited menu of binaries for interpreting culture, and (3) reductionist interpretations.

A Demonized Influence

For centuries, many Christians, including Spanish Catholics, blamed the Jews, not only for the death of Christ, but also for the various calamities that befell them. A similar blame game is happening today. Almost any major problem of the Filipino today is attributed to "colonial" influence, particularly the Spanish. Even the traffic problem in Philippine cities is blamed on Western colonialism (Baetiong 1999);¹² likewise the popular belief in *aswang*, witches who sever themselves in two before hunting for victims (Caruncho 1999).¹³ Or, lately, even natural disasters! At the open forum of the conference in June 2003, on Spanish-Filipino relations, a teacher from Taguig City said that some of his townmates blame the country's earthquakes, fires, typhoons on the fact that it is named after a bad Spanish king. Given all these, how then can Filipinos take pride in their supposedly "corrupted" culture?

Two things can be noted about this demonization: (1) In key popular accusations, no empirical evidence is offered. (2) In some other cases, no attempt is made to situate an event, practice, or institution within its historic and cultural context.

No doubt the social order that prevailed between 1565 and 1898 distributed power unequally. Power was concentrated at the upper levels of the state and the Church. This, of course, is what we would find in any state in any part of the world before the spread of liberal democracy in the nineteenth century. In addition it was a colonial system. It gave more rights to those who came from the Spanish peninsula; there was no popular representation; abuses were

rampant. Moreover, it united religion and the state and thus gave one religion and its officials a monopoly on truth. Still, not every accusation made today about that period can be accepted, in the name of nationalism and anticolonialism, without supporting evidence.

Where is the evidence? Examples of accusations without evidence are the following: (1) that the barong Tagalog was the result of racial discrimination, and (2) that all churches during the Spanish period were built with "forced labor."

Supposedly the Spaniards wanted to humiliate the *indios* by denying them the right to tuck in their shirt. Moreover the fabric had to be gauzy so as to expose weapons. But, to date no such law or ordinance has been brought forward as proof!¹⁴ In truth the Spaniards did not have to impose a ban. Indian traders then as now wore their loose long sleeved *kurta* over their equally loose pants. So likewise did the Chinese traders. If one lives in the tropics, isn't it more convenient to free one's shirttails? As for the gauze, filmy textiles let the air through. Thus *jusi* and *piña*. Since women wore see-through blouses made of these—despite churchmen's protests—there was no reason why the men could not either. I shall go back to these examples in the essays.

Another allegation is that stone monuments, like the walls of Intramuros and the churches, were built with "forced labor." Again the issue turns on proof. Father Merino (1987, 50–51) cites a sixteenth-century document, "Quentas de la muralla para su Magestad," which lists in detail the wages paid the workers who built these walls: P50 in gold a month for the maestro, one *tomin*, or gold real, per week, plus a rice ration, for the peon. The maestro was not European. Merino believes him to be a native, rather than Chinese, because he, like the rest of the workers, had no family name.

Turning to the churches, accounts by Isacio Rodriguez, OSA (1976), and Pedro Galende, OSA (1987), of how such major churches, like San Agustín in Intramuros or the monastery of Guadalupe in Makati, were built at the turn of the sixteenth cen-

tury share a common theme: shortages of funds, inadequate revenues from exates, and the need for donations. When the construction of the present cathedral of Vigan began in 1790, funds did not suffice. Bishop Blaquier, OSA, mentions in 1799 that the parishioners contributed sand, water, gravel, lime, stones, and wood "but not everything." Monetary contributions were also solicited from wealthy Spaniards living outside the Ilocos. Skilled workmen were hired and paid for using the parish income.¹⁵ Indeed his predecessor, Bishop Ruiz, OSA, became destitute from spending his own limited stipend on the project. He appealed to the king (Scharpf 1985, 35).

I only ask for the alms Your Majesty may wish to give me, while taking note of the present condition of the enterprise, the amount I have spent on it, and what else needs to be spent. Rest assured that the last maravedi Your Majesty gives me shall be spent on the church, and not only this, I shall also spend whatever I can save from my expenses as in fact I have done till now.

He had no money to order masses with to be said on his behalf after death.

Writing in 1803–1805, Joaquín Martínez de Zuñiga, OSA, said that when a new church of solid materials had to be built in the islands, the parish priest "obliged the indios to assemble together with the materials." But what would "obliging" mean? The parish priest "paid for the masons, carpenters, nails, tiles, and other materials that could not be found in the towns. In these payments, he made use of the rights that pertained to the church and at times his own stipends." Zuñiga even claims that this is "how all the churches of the Philippines have been made" ([1803–1805] 1897, 203).¹⁶

At the heart of this demonization of Spanish influence is a moralistic approach to the social sciences widely popular in the Philippines. History and culture are seen as a struggle between good and evil. Historians are expected to paint the pre-Hispanic past as a won-

drous Golden Age to be restored. Should one point out the intervil-
lage wars and the slaving raids that occurred, one gets criticized for
being "colonial." Anthropologists and sociologists are likewise ex-
pected to describe only "ideal" Filipino values, preferably those that
imply self-determination, rather than actual values that operate in
everyday life. Portraits of rural villages are expected to glow with
harmony, fellowship, and *bayanihan*.¹⁷ Sociology and anthropology
are confused with moral social philosophy.¹⁸ But the two could never
play such a role. They merely wish to understand and interpret a
given pattern of behavior in all its complexity.

No Sense of Context. A serious failing of some present evaluations
made of the Spanish period is that they float in limbo because they
do not look at either the historical or the cultural context of the
person, event, or pattern under review. They do not consider what
was possible and what was not in past period. They judge the past
exclusively in terms of present standards. They are "presentist." True,
we cannot help but look at the world from a given perspective; we
are most familiar with our present values and norms. Nonetheless, a
trained scholar should realize that previous generations may have
had different values and norms. For the sociologist Anthony Giddens
(1982, 30), people act on the basis of knowledge that is available to
them at a particular time and place. There are unforeseen conse-
quences to human actions. We are humans, not omniscient gods!
Grossberg (in Hall and Du Gay 1996, 100-1) adds that we experi-
ence the world from a particular position in space. Our capacity for
taking charge of our lives "to make history," for negotiating with
others to our best advantage, depends on our access to particular
kinds of places.

Without this cultural and historical relativism, we cannot ap-
preciate the achievements of our own ancestors, whether pre-Hispanic
or Hispanized. Unknowingly, we belittle them for not anticipating
our present fashions. This may be one reason why many are reluc-
tant to depict our indigenous ancestors in Luzon and the Visayas in

loincloth rather than in sarongs. They think it shameful. On the
contrary, within the context of a non-Moslem, non-Christian soci-
ety in the tropics, wearing a loincloth makes perfect sense.¹⁹

It is claimed that the Spaniards were so perverse that they
deliberately kept Filipinos ignorant.²⁰ Renato Constantino (1978,
36), whose writings on nationalism and anti-imperialism are influ-
ential, speaks of the "Spanish legacy of ignorance." Moreover, the
accusation is that the Spaniards forced Filipinos to render forced
labor on state-sponsored projects. Many do not realize that the edu-
cational system in nineteenth-century Philippines was actually ahead
of that of other Asian countries of the period. Or that corvee labor
has characterized even societies in independent, noncolonial states.

Today free public education on at least the primary level forms
a basic pillar of public policy in nation-states all over the world
because of several reasons. Industrialism requires skilled, literate la-
bor to run the machines. Moreover the merchant class is now
dominant; they know that education confers advantages in trading
(Cipolla 1969).

But the situation differed in the eighteenth century on the eve
of the revolutions that led to the victory of capitalism and industri-
alism. Since most states then were monarchies whose subjects were
mostly farmers handling simple tools, understandably the educa-
tional system even in Western Europe concentrated on educating
the elite, namely, the clergy, nobility, and merchants. The situation
changed radically with the triumph of bourgeois-led liberal democ-
racy and industrialism. For understanding current issues and,
especially, for operating machinery, literacy was needed. During the
nineteenth century, Western nation-states made public schooling
compulsory (ibid.). In 1857, the Spanish government made it man-
datory to open public schools in major towns in the Spanish peninsula
(EUIEA 1925, 1,738). Shortly after, in 1863, they did the same for
the Philippines "with compulsory attendance for the pupils, and
Sunday schools for adults" (Corpuz 1989, 500). Even before this
decree, however, many parishes, for instance in Cebu, already had

both temporally and spatially. Monetization increased during the nineteenth century. At the same time its spread throughout the islands was uneven. It would have been more available in metropolitan and more commercial areas like Cebu than in poorer areas like Bohol.

Sometimes, it is not just the social and cultural context that is ignored. An author's words are interpreted in isolation from his other overall message. A classic example of this is how poor Sinibaldo de Mas ([1842] 1963) is misrepresented. Supposedly he advocated that indios should not be educated and that they should be obliged to wear a different costume. In fact he advocated the exact opposite. Sent to Manila to do a report on conditions in the islands, he proposed two options: either retain the colony or prepare it for independence. If Spain wanted to retain the colony, then it was imperative to keep the indio in his place by not educating him and by even compelling the use of a separate costume. However, if Spain wanted to let go, it should educate the indio and treat him as an equal. He concludes by saying that he preferred granting independence. "Why deny other peoples the benefit that we seek for our own motherland?" (De Mas [1842] 1963, 89, 194).²² Strangely enough, Corpuz's (1965, 37) popular history of the Philippines quotes De Mas's words about keeping the indio in place while ignoring both the hypothetical "If" and De Mas's own liberal preference. He thus makes it appear that De Mas was recommending not teaching Spanish, and then adds that it suited the Spanish priests to be the intermediary between natives and Spaniards. He says that because of this official indifference, only a few Filipinos, unlike Spanish Americans, speak Spanish.²³

Though Carlos Quirino (1978) provides an accurate reading of De Mas,²⁴ it is Corpuz's misreading that has become the accepted gospel truth.

A second reason for this unease about identity is that the unconscious binary contrasts used in interpreting data are just two. Other fruitful contrasts are overlooked.

A Limited Menu of Binary Contrasts

Following Levi-Strauss, there are anthropologists who claim that the mind thinks spontaneously in binaries when interpreting data. I notice that much of current discourse about Filipino history and culture is shaped by two binaries: (1) colonial versus noncolonial/anticolonial, and (2) Asia versus West.

Beyond Colonial versus Noncolonial. "Colonial" is equated with subservience and lack of freedom, "noncolonial/anticolonial" with assertion and freedom. I agree that this theme is important. The Philippines has been dominated by foreign powers, and continues to be so today, particularly by the U.S. However, there are other themes that also matter and that cannot be reduced to it.

For instance, there is the binary: "kin-based community" versus "community broader than the kin." We complain that Filipinos are individualistic; many seem unable to think of a common good on the level of a city, a province, or the nation. Comparing ourselves to the Japanese and the Thais, we think this individualism is all because of colonialism. But is this really true, were we united as a people before 1565? My opening essay in this collection shows this was not the case and articulates some of the obstacles. Today loyalty to the kin above all other loyalties persists in many circles, though not in all. We should be careful of reducing this to either Western influence or to colonial residues.

Another ignored binary contrast is: "the state (as a form of political organization) versus the nonstate." The "nation" [*bansa*] has become part of ordinary discourse. But not the "state" [*estado*]. And yet major problems we have concerning both identity and other domains are related to this contrast. The origin of the state in the Philippines and its challenges past and present need to be highlighted. We should beware of calling the pre-1565 barangay a "city-state" or an "ethnic state."

The nature of the state²⁵ is discussed at great length in the first essay where it is a key variable. Let me point out a major fea-

ture. The state is a political organization that can mobilize not just a small locality or a group of families, but thousands, because it has a continuous formal government existing everyday. Such a government exists because a stable source of revenue through taxation exists. And this revenue comes about because this political organization controls the use of weapons within its jurisdiction, and hence the instruments of coercion. In contrast, nonstates, like those that existed in our inaccessible uplands down to the middle of the twentieth century, claim the allegiance of only a locality, be this a lineage or interrelated lineages. Kinship is often the bond that links all together. Since adult males often carry weapons as their right, the existing government has limited powers. It cannot exact obedience to laws that contradict the interests of particular adults, for instance, surrendering part of their income to support a formal government.

Filipinos look with envy at Meiji Japan for modernizing overnight in the face of Western imperialism. Looking at themselves, they blame their disunity on colonialism. They forget that despite civil wars and struggles between shogun and emperor, Japanese leaders by the 1880s were aware of the bonds that linked all together regardless of kin, class, and regional differences in speech. They had at least a millennium and a half of living together under a state led by one monarch. Can we say this of Filipinos in the 1880s or of Filipinos before 1565? Surely not.

Today the Philippine state must compete vis-à-vis other nation-states. It has to improve its infrastructure, attract investments and offer more products. To do all these, it has to project internal stability. This image, in contrast to its neighbors, it does not have. Nor is this state able to collect enough taxes. Part of the problem indeed is an attitude of dependency on the U.S. But on the grassroots level, it may be that our long nonstate tradition continues to influence many into avoiding taxes and into carrying weapons.

Finally, another binary that is glossed over is "predemocratic versus democratic state." Democracy matters because every individual has rights as a human being and as a citizen. But there seems to be a

double standard when we look at the past. When critiquing the Spanish record before 1896, we assume that the Thais, Chinese, Japanese, or even the people of Sulu and Maguindanao, who lived under their unconquered monarchs, had more rights than our eighteenth-century ancestors. While we lived in a midnight, supposedly our neighbors flourished in the sun of freedom and can, therefore, be proud of their traditions. Given that our neighbors lived in predemocratic monarchies, we may wonder how much sun they enjoyed.

Beyond Asia versus West. The Filipino's achievements are often not appreciated enough either by himself or by others because they do not seem "Asian" enough. But what is "Asia"? What is "Southeast Asia"? These are discussed by two essays.

How true is it that while other Asians have retained their original culture, the Christian Filipinos have lost theirs? The problem is that "authenticity" is confused with "exoticism." And exoticism is identified with being non-Western. The more non-Westernized a culture, supposedly, the more authentic it is. Such a definition by its very nature works against the lowland Christian Filipino.

If, however, we define authenticity as continuity with major patterns in early Austronesian culture, we may be pleasantly surprised.²⁶ Filipinos, Malaysians, Indonesians, Micronesians, and Polynesians belong to what is called the Austronesian family of languages. Associated with this family is a complex of cultural traits that anthropologists have identified on the basis of studies of prehistory and of the culture of peoples that escaped Christianity, Islam, Confucianism, and Buddhism until fairly recently. Some traits are the following: veneration of ancestral spirits; reverence for particular rocks, mountains, trees, bodies of water, and animals such as the snake and crocodile; a fondness for pigs and dogs; for men, the use of tattoos and loincloth; for women, a wraparound skirt; in kinship, equal rights among men and women in inheriting and transmitting property. Both Islam and Christianity frown on the veneration of

ancestral spirits and on reverence for aspects of nature. Islam despises both pigs and dogs as dirty, but Christianity does not. Both Islam and Christianity have discouraged tattooing and the use of loincloth as indecent. But while Islam considers the exposure of men's thighs as indecent, Christianity does not. Both Christianity and Islam insist on covering women's breasts. Some groups in Islam take the further step of covering a woman's figure, including her hair, and even her face. But Christians let their women roam around with exposed hair, shoulders, arms, and thighs. Islam favors giving men a larger share of the parental inheritance. In contrast equal inheritance by both men and women is likewise a tradition in Western Christian societies, including Spain.

Traditional dancing in the Cordillera brings male and female performers together. This, too, is the case among lowland Christian Filipinos who often equate dancing with moving in rhythm with a partner of the opposite sex. In the *tinikling*, a man and a woman weave in and out of bamboo canes that players clap together in rhythm. Is this the case in the *singkil*? When danced correctly, the *singkil* should employ only female dancers, according to Usopay Camar, a Maranao scholar. In the Bayanihan version, made by Christian Filipinos for the stage, a prince stands on stage brandishing a kris. This mixing of the sexes goes against Moslem tradition as practised among the Maranao. Moreover, a Moslem man does not display his sword in front of women, nor bare his chest (Camar 1970, 45-51). We turn to the *tinikling*. The Visayans, according to the dance scholar Edru Abraham (1993), used a Spanish dance form (the quick-paced jota with its complex footwork), when they choreographed their own version of the bamboo dance (which is found all over Southeast Asia), and composed a melody to accompany it. The Spanish jota, like the dances of the Ifugaos and the Kalingas and unlike those of the Maranao, encourages men and women to dance together. Who indeed is closer to the original, hypothetical Austronesian culture: the Christian Visayan or the Moslem Maranao?

There is thus a binary contrast that many are unaware of: "Austronesian" versus "non-Austronesian." And still another: "authentic" versus "nonauthentic." The "exotic" is not the same as the "authentic." The exotic is what is unfamiliar—from the point of view of the outsider. This in itself does not guarantee that the exotic self is true to either its past or to its convictions.

Is Rizal "authentic"? For the Euroamerican, his ideas and his language are certainly not exotic. How about Emilio Jacinto and Andres Bonifacio? They may have written in Tagalog, but they were influenced by Freemasonry and by Christianity. Are the three less authentic than the isolated mountain villager who conforms to the Euroamerican's stereotype of a true Asian? In the case of all three, they believed in their vision and sacrificed everything for it. "Authenticity" has another meaning. Existentialism defines it as a choice consciously made and acted out. It is fidelity to one's self in relation to one's concrete circumstances. The concerns of Rizal, Jacinto, and Bonifacio were certainly far removed from those of our Austronesian ancestors or of our cousins in the uplands.²⁷ But then they lived in a major, international port city of the nineteenth century that headed an entire archipelago. The authentic should not be confused with the exotic.²⁸

A third reason for our unease about our culture and history is a prevailing "reductionism" whose oversimplification can be dangerous.

Reductionist Interpretations

The claim that all Spanish influence is evil injures our sense of national identity. So likewise is the notion that Filipinos lost their culture and ended up as mere copycats. Almost anything with a Spanish name is now suspected as being non-Filipino even if it is original. The mestiza dress with its butterfly sleeves; the wood-and-stone house with its sliding shell windows; the adobo which pickles meat in garlic, vinegar, and soy sauce; the many lively jotás: Anything that carries a Spanish term or seems faintly Spanish stirs doubts

among educated Filipinos. "How can these be Filipino if they are not indigenous?" On the other hand, despite the value placed on the indigenous, few seem to bother to read the voluminous anthropological ethnographies on our brothers and sisters in the non-Hispanized parts of the Philippines during the early part of the twentieth century, or the detailed accounts by the early European travellers on sixteenth-century Philippine societies. I have gone through many academic papers that tend to fantasize when alluding to indigenous, non-Hispanized culture because they ignore these accounts and ethnographies. As a result they fail to realize how strong and persistent indigenous ways are even in the lowlands, and that these modify the foreign.

Moreover, notions of culture in the Philippines tend to be static: Many use "culture" [*kultura/kalinangan*] and "race" [*lahi*] interchangeably. In January 2003, the permanent exhibit at the National Museum entitled *History of the Filipino People* was translated as *Kasaysayan ng Lahi*. History of the Race! This is a dangerous confusion that any basic textbook in introductory anthropology critiques. For anthropologists today, culture refers to systems of beliefs and values communicated through symbols, especially language. Because symbols are invented by a community and can be acquired through learning, symbols can change. They can also be imported from or exported to other communities. On the other hand, physical characteristics, like skin color, are inherited genetically. They have nothing to do with behavior; nor can they be changed. And yet in 1999, the *Philippine Daily Inquirer* ran a series of articles extolling achievements of Filipinos, over the past two millennia, which show the nobility of the Filipino race.³² I shall discuss this and other issues raised above in the essays.

There is no metaphysical principle—nor biological law—which mandates that members of a culture should borrow only from a given culture rather than from another. People often assume that the Filipino would have been better off borrowing from his neighbors in Asia and Southeast Asia rather than from the West. And yet while

the Chinese kinship system is patrilineal—that is, property is transmitted only through the sons, especially the eldest son—the Spanish system is bilateral. Surely the Filipino cannot be faulted for feeling more at home in a system spiritually closer to his, even if it came from farther away.

Because culture is an open symbolic system, we can assume that the Filipino could not have merely blindly borrowed from the West. He must have transformed what he got and given it new unsuspected meanings. This I discuss in an essay. Consider religion. Two of the most popular Virgins in the islands, those of Manaoag and of Antipolo, are associated with trees. This is significant because we know that our ancestors revered trees as abodes of spirits. How did trees get associated with Mary, given that the Church kept tight control over representations? The image of Our Lady of Peace and Good Voyage was made in Mexico and brought over in a galleon in 1626. Hence the brown features. Installed in Antipolo, a story circulated that the image would disappear and appear instead on a tree. The church authorities took this as a sign that the Virgin wanted her shrine to be built elsewhere.³³ We can assume that a subtle negotiation took place: between the native consciousness insisting on a meaningful location, the tree, and the foreign priests equally vehement about the church enclosure as the location. Moreover, precisely because Filipinos read their own meanings into icons and rituals, the oppressed—as Reynaldo Ileto (1979) tells us—saw themselves as Kristos defending the poor against the priests and the bureaucrats. Anthony Giddens (1982, 28 ff.) says it is not a question of choosing between Marx and Heidegger, between an image of man upon whom material forces act and one which posits him questing for meaning. Both are needed to complete the picture.

Static, too, are our notions of history. I hear appeals to "return to our glorious past" or to "return to our indigenous past." There is value in such appeals, for an aggressive colonialism, whether Spanish or American, has made many shy about their indigenous heritage. There is value, too, in returning to the use of the vernacular lan-

guages, for these carry our indigenous heritage. Indeed I must confess to an unease in using English in discussing identity. Whenever possible, I prefer to use the vernacular because this forces me to rethink abstract concepts in a clear, concrete way. Also there is genuine communication. But the reality, however, is that in both the Visayas and Mindanao, the colleagues I wish to reach complain when the discourse is completely in Filipino.

We need a dialectical interpretation of both culture and history. Interpretations of the shift from one culture to another or from historical context to another could benefit from that use of *Aufhebung* found in both Hegel and Marx. Often people think in terms of "Either . . . or," that is, a choice between the colonial and the anticolonial, the indigenous or the Western, the pre-Hispanic or the Hispanic. I believe it is really a case of "Yes . . . but . . ." Yes, to certain features of Westernization; no to others and at the same time going beyond them to work out a better order. Alternatively, it is also a case of "No . . . but . . ." Karl Marx does indeed show that the triumph of one class over the other is a case of "Either . . . or": the proletariat replaces the bourgeoisie. But the transformation of capitalism into socialism is a case of "Yes . . . but . . ." Or a "No . . . but . . ." More precisely of how one set of social relations is transformed into another.

I mention Marx because since the 1970s, interpretations of him by some nationalists have influenced many Filipinos—even those who would never consider themselves Marxist in any way. But it is easy to misinterpret Marx if one uses a mechanical, rather than a dialectical, approach. Consider Marx's example of how forces within nineteenth-century capitalism lead to the negation of capitalism itself. Thus in *Capital 3*, the emergence of companies that sell stocks to the public is regarded as an omen. As an enterprise grows, the capitalist may no longer be able to fully finance all its capital needs. He must sell stocks to the public. The total profit he henceforth receives takes the form of interest, as mere compensation for owning capital that now is entirely divorced from the process of reproducing

wealth. Such a company constitutes a transition in the conversion of the process of production from an individual into a social one. "This is the *Aufhebung* of the capitalist mode of production within the capitalist mode of production itself" (Marx [1894] 1978–1981, 569).¹¹ That capitalist invention, stock companies, is retained but its individualistic, exploitative character is reduced through the sale of stocks; at the same time it is transformed into something other than itself: a publicly owned company. For Shlomo Avineri (1968, 37)—in orientation a Social Democrat rather than a Leninist—Marx's "*Aufhebung* means abolition, transcendence, and preservation." Marx is not saying that capitalist institutions must be forcibly extinguished, nor capitalists exterminated.

Unfortunately, translations of this tricky German concept have sometimes chosen the easy way out by using only "abolition." This dangerous simplification by rigid interpretations of Marx has led to massive purges of supposed enemies of the people in totalitarian states.

Aufhebung, or supersession, happens continually in our own daily lives. "One's early beliefs . . . are sublated in one's later, more measured beliefs or one's early drafts in one's final draft" (Inwood 1992, 283).

Philippine history and culture can be read as a series of *Aufhebung*. Consider, for instance, the encounter between indigenous religion and Christianity. The former venerated trees as abodes of spirits. Most likely, such veneration involved only those from a locality or from a cluster of villages rather than an entire region, for relations between barangays ranged from trade to armed conflict. In contrast Christianity's advocacy of various cults, such as of Mary, were supralocal. The Church was for all believers. Nonetheless elements from the indigenous religion, such as the tree, were retained. This now became the abode of a new spirit, the Mother of God. Still later—as Reynaldo Ileto (1979) and others suggest—ordinary people saw new meanings into cults such as this. The oppressed saw in the verses of poems imbued with Christian doctrine an ideology that

justified their revolt against the rich, the educated, and even against the priests themselves.²²

Using *Aufhebung* has the added advantage of allowing us to cross the gap between the Actual and the Ideal, the Is and the Ought. From our current perspective, a previous form of behavior or a past institution may seem narrow and repressive. However, elements in it may lead to a more rational way of acting and thinking. Or else, those elements may have value, seen from another perspective. They could thus be retained and at the same time transcended. Neither indigenous society nor colonial society can be normative from our present, democratic perspective which stresses human rights. But some of their practices, like their architecture, literature, and music, have value. The same can be said for paganism and for pre-Vatican II Catholicism. In Singapore, at a 1996 conference for French-speaking Southeast Asian professors, I heard a French scholar lecture eloquently on how the notion of the Mystical Body of Christ enabled the subjects of the kings of France to realize, over the course of centuries, that, despite differences in language and custom, they formed one body politic. When I asked him afterwards if he was a practicing Catholic, he answered, "I am an atheist. Besides, I know how tolerant the French Church was until the 1950s. But I appreciate its contributions to French culture." I dream of finding Filipino atheists and agnostics who regard our baroque churches, together with the rice terraces or the farmer's house, as a basic component of their heritage.

The Essays

These essays were written for various conferences and periodicals at different times, and so did not at the start constitute a single narrative. A common thread, nonetheless, is the need to look at lowland Christian Filipino culture, with its mixture of the indigenous and the Hispanic, in a more positive light.

Part 1 deals with one frequent charge, namely, that Hispanization and Westernization subverted the indigenous sense of

community by introducing the serpent of individualism. I question whether the notion of private ownership of strategic resources came in only with Spain by looking at both the early Spanish chronicles and twentieth-century ethnographies written by anthropologists on upland peoples. I also question whether our persistent problems in transcending the good of our kin group are due to Spanish influence. Again I examine the same sources mentioned above. Indeed there are institutions created during the Spanish period that we use today to create a suprapkin sense of common good. One such institution is the "state" which admittedly is ambivalent because its basic instruments, like taxation, have been oppressive. A third essay examines the accusation that during the 1896 Revolution the more Hispanized sector of society, the elite, rejected the emerging vision of a national community.

Part 2 responds to the accusation that lowland Christian Filipino culture is "elitist" and "derivative." At issue is not culture, in general, but rather what we can call "civil culture." Such cultures are prestigious worldwide. But along with the benefits are costs. The elitism that Filipinos associate with Spanish influence, for instance, in education, has, in fact, been true of all civil cultures until democracy's advent. There is a Christian Filipino civil culture that differs from the Spanish and has its own achievements. True, it has inconsistencies and contradictions but this does not mean that it is "schizophrenic" and "bastardized," as many educated Filipinos claim it to be. Culture consists of symbols which are inherently arbitrary.

Part 3 examines appeals to joining "Asia" and "Southeast Asia" and shows that though we should indeed participate in both, we should realize that both concepts were invented by Westerners and that their content tends to exclude Westernized peoples like us. We Filipinos should reexamine these concepts. Looked at from another angle, the Hispanized Filipino, whether farmer or urbanite, has practices, for instance in costume, religion, or architecture, that continue his Austronesian heritage and, at the same time, link him to Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic traditions.

Notes

1. This delicious dish combines beef, vegetables, and banana blossom in a thick ground peanut sauce with bagoong as the dipping sauce. It was probably inspired by curry [*kari* in Indonesian], but it is not spicy and has different characteristics such as the use of annatto [*atswere* in Tagalog], which came in from Mexican Indians.

2. In Mindanao and Sulu, such structures may have appeared earlier, by the fifteenth century, thanks to the introduction of Islam. In Luzon, the Ifugao rice terraces, carved onto the mountains by hand and drawing water from watershed to ponds, constitute an engineering marvel. However, in my text, I refer to stone structures that symbolize the cosmos. Moreover, their date remains unresolved at present: 2,000 years ago or only during the past 500 years? Maher (1978, 56) excavated charcoal associated with a constructed terrace surface and concluded on the basis of a radiocarbon analysis of charcoal fragments that it dated back three thousand years ago. On the other hand Keesing (1962, 323), studying the patterns of migration to the Cordillera says that the Ifugaos entered their present homeland only during the Spanish period. Originally lowlanders, they fled Spanish impositions.

3. This uneasiness about the Filipino's cultural heritage affects even Catholic Church officials. At a conference in Cagayan de Oro in 1996 on cultural heritage, a young theologian said that in the Ilocos, people are happy when a colonial church finally collapses. "They are expensive to maintain. And they are symbols of colonialism." He subscribes to the popular belief that they were built with "forced labor." Given the fact that even educated, practicing Catholics see Spanish period churches as symbols of "slave labor," tourism officials lack the enthusiasm needed to promote them. When tour guides do bring people to ancient churches, they focus on the imagined evils of the priests. Thus the guide at Narrat, Ilocos Norte, routinely tells visitors at the ruins of the convent that "That lone column of brick in the patio was a guillotine where the friars would execute their enemies." When I tried to explain what a guillotine is, and that it is French rather than Spanish, he ignored me.

4. Shortly after the fall of the Bastille in 1789, the newly formed National Assembly formed a commission to inventory all assets that should form the nation's property and to protect all works of art within France (Bermond 1999). This set a precedent for other nation states.

5. It was the Briton, Edward Tylor ([1871] 1958), who defined "culture" as we now use it, that is, as a society's repertoire of knowledge and practices that is acquired through learning. Boas's ideas were an obvious inspiration to the

German-born and educated American anthropologist Franz Boas who conceived of a people's culture as the outcome of a few key ideas. Through his students, Alfred Kroeber and Ruth Benedict, his influence on subsequent anthropologists has been immense (Vogel 1975).

6. Both the nation-state and the relations between the local and the global are discussed by new anthropological writing (see Foster 1991, Alonso 1994, Kearney 1995).

7. Mickunas (1994) distinguishes between "archaic" nationalism and "modernizing" nationalism. The former claims that individual members of a nation bear the national spirit of an original people. It emphasizes a return to a narrowly defined mythic past via sacral rituals and places. Nationalism in nineteenth-century Germany and Eastern Europe, and in the present-day Middle East and the republics of the former Soviet Union exhibits these archaic tendencies. In contrast "modernizing" nationalism bases nationality on the recognition of basic individual rights within a democratic system. While it upholds a dominant myth, it can tolerate other myths within its borders. Mickunas regards the U.S., France and, to a certain extent, Britain as examples of this second type of nationalism—which he evidently prefers.

8. To qualify: Some of the individuals, I know, who showed a keen appreciation for Hispanized Filipino culture were Britons, Australians, and Anglo-Americans. However, these few were in academe.

9. It did not evaluate particular groups like the Apo Hiking Society, River Maya, or Joey Ayala's Bagong Lumad. It had praise only for Freddie Aguilar—perhaps because his international reputation simply cannot be ignored.

10. The Visayan instructors in Hawaii led their students with *uno, dos, tres*, and so on and named particular steps with poetic names such as *de abanico* [fan-like]. Willey (1994, 23) describes other Hispanic components.

11. This is based on the study of Quilis (1984).

12. The urban planner Palafox argues that the Spaniards introduced the plaza complex which concentrated major activities around the plaza where the homes of the wealthy were located; at the same time they compelled the peasants to live away from the center close to their fields. Unfortunately this argument ignores the persistent efforts by the Spanish authorities to settle all Filipinos under the church bells [*bajo las campanas*] (Reed 1978, 15). The ordinary farmer resisted this as impractical because it meant a longer walk to the fields. The argument also ignores the fact that in traditional preindustrial cities all over the world, the dwellings of the wealthy do indeed congregate in the center because of proximity to many services (Sjoberg 1960). Nor does the argument mention obvious reasons why traffic is a mess in present-day Filipino towns: Private ve-

bikes are preferred to motor transport; buses and jeepneys use the highways as their terminals; vendors sell right on the roads. Surely, all these are not due to colonial influence.

13. The tale of the bloodsucker who divides in half is found in other Southeast Asian countries. The Cambodian version features a severed head that flies at night with its entrails exposed (Ramos 1990, xviii-xix). Note, too, that the name for witch in Flores, Indonesia, is *tuangi*.

14. De la Torre (1986, 15) mentions this supposed Spanish restriction but merely concludes that "These allegations, though, deserve further study."

15. When repairs had to be made in 1845, Father Bumatay, whose family name is Ilokano, withdrew money from the cathedral treasury (King 1991, 14).

16. To be sure the borderline between corvée labor for the government and voluntary labor for the church, at times, disappeared as when the townspeople of Majayjay were exempted by the government in 1660 and in 1707 from rendering taxes in the form of personal services for a given period so that they could repair their crumbling church. The task of reinforcing the walls with an extra width in a small town of only four thousand inhabitants provoked protests which apparently were resolved after a town meeting. At the same time it is noteworthy that the same report mentions that twelve carpenters who worked on the reconstruction of the church in 1716 were paid out of a general fund created from fines on absentees (Palason 1964, 13-14).

17. In the 1990s, I participated in a weekly seminar that lasted for several months. Its theme was "community." The organizers were uncomfortable when I pointed out that what this means for the farmer may differ from what it means for an NGO worker and that even in the non-Hispanized upland villages, conflicts occur between villages.

18. Just four years ago, a newspaper ad placed by a well-known private, religious school announced an opening for a sociology teacher. Qualifications needed: The applicant had to have a degree in "Law, Political Science, or Philosophy." There was no mention of sociology.

19. Many Filipinos will not look at the animist, non-Moslem Filipinos of the Cordillera or Mindanao highlands as a possible image of what they were before Christianization. In the recent grand parade of 12 June 1996, the first tableau represented pre-Hispanic shamans. Having seen other parades and festival tableaux that represent the pre-Hispanic past, I was not surprised to see the same mistake repeated. The actors should have been tattooed all over and in loincloth. Instead they had some body paint on their arms to suggest tattoos, but none on their chests and backs. And they wore batik sarongs.

20. An example of this position is that of Abella's (1977).

21. He bases his analysis on Pedro de San Buenaventura's *Vocabulario de lengua tagala el romance castellano presto primero* [Vocabulary of the Tagalog Language with Castilian Romance (given first)] printed by Tomas Pinpin and Domingo Loag in Pila, Laguna, 1613.

22. The Spanish original reads: *Porque negar a otros el beneficio que para nuestra patria descamos?*

23. Maria Cristina Barron Soto, a historian connected with the Universidad Iberoamericana in Mexico, offers a contrary view. The Spanish language spread in the Americas because of (1) Spanish migration and (2) nationalism. Where there were more lay Spanish migrants, the language became established as the everyday tongue. Where there were less of them, American Indian languages kept their ground. And yet despite heavy Spanish migration, only 20 percent of Mexicans spoke Spanish in 1821. Spanish gained ground following independence because Mexico's leaders found it more effective in promoting unity than any of the many, actively used Indian languages. She claims that though Spanish migration to the Philippines was minimal, had the Malolos Republic prevailed, it would have promoted Spanish as the instrument of national unity. However, the Americans triumphed over the Malolos Republic and successfully imposed English through the educational system. (Unfortunately, as this book goes to press, I do not have a copy of her published article.)

24. But prejudices die hard. One caption made by the editorial staff for a photo accompanying Quirino's article contradicts his text. It says that "Sinibaldo de Mas suggested that natives had to dress differently to distinguish them from the Spaniards. Native *principales* are shown wearing their shirts out." Would a course on remedial reading have helped the caption-writer?

25. The nature of the state and its formation is a major topic in political anthropology. The extensive bibliography on this is referred to in the opening essay.

26. To understand what Austronesian cultures were like before the advent of outside influences, I have used Bellwood's (1985) classic study and various ethnographies on upland peoples of the Philippines and Indonesia. A good starting point are the summaries of various ethnographies per ethnolinguistic group made by the Human Relations Area Files for Taiwan and the Philippines (Lebar 1975) and for Indonesia (Geertz 1963).

27. An American author, whose name escapes me, once claimed that Rizal was more "European" than Filipino. The remark betrays an extremely static notion of culture. It is saying that sophistication and being Filipino do not go together. But Filipinos who claim that only the ancestral bamboo-and-thatch house is truly Filipino, and dismiss as foreign all urban structures since the sixteenth century, are not far removed from this American.

28. When some Filipinos try to imagine what their ancestors were like before Legaspi, they look at Malays, Sumatrans, Javanese, and Balinese of today, or the Ilocos and the Maranao. Filipinos who visit Indonesia lament that whereas they have retained their culture, we have lost ours. This assertion has no basis.

29. Thus, too, the publishing house that produced the ten-volume *Filipino Heritage* of 1978 called itself "Lahing Pilipino."

30. Wende (1998) has a similar interpretation of the way Filipinos reinterpreted Christian images and rituals. He mentions the cult of Antipolo in particular.

31. The original German text reads: *Es ist dies die Aufhebung der kapitalistischen Produktionsweise innerhalb der kapitalistischen Produktionsweise selbst* (Mao [1894] 1967, 454). My interpretation relies heavily on that of Shlomo Avineri (1968). Because I am fond of Hegel, I find this approach more relevant. Also, Marx criticized Hegel's content rather than his method because it did not deal with material, economic forces at work in society. The different levels of "commodification" in Hegel, particularly *Aufhebung*, are analyzed by Grégoire (1958, 23-26) and Inwood (1992, 283).

32. *Aufhebung* is also used by Nick Joaquin (1989) when he shows how the misadventure laid by friar and conquistador gave the Filipino revolutionary materials with which to create a sense of community broader than that of kinship and village. But both Joaquin and Ilo to have been misunderstood. I heard a writer with liberal commitments scoff at Ilo for interpreting Philippine history "as salvation history." On the other hand Nick Joaquin is pilloried by many for praising the *Herosa* pan and for supposedly being blind to its dark side. They forget that his father was an official in Aguinaldo's army and that the major heroes of his fiction are soldiers and generals of the 1896 Revolution. One of the best eulogies ever written of the Propaganda and the Revolution is the concluding page-long paragraph of Joaquin's *A Question of Heroes* (1977).

PART I

Constructions of Community and Identity